



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/537,117	07/01/2005	Daisuke Awakura	10742.00	8343
25265	7590	09/17/2008	EXAMINER	
MARK D MILLER			SZNAIDMAN, MARCOS L.	
KIMBLE, MACMICHAEL & UPTON			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
5260 NORTH PALM AVENUE				
SUITE 221			1611	
FRESNO, CA 93704				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/17/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/537,117	Applicant(s) AWAKURA ET AL.
	Examiner MARCOS SZNAIDMAN	Art Unit 1611

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 June 2008.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) 1-10 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This is in response to applicant's reply dated June 10, 2008.

Previous Restriction/Election dated on March 31, 2008, and mailed on April 10, 2008 is withdrawn. This new set of restriction/elections replaces the previous one.

Claim Objections

Claim 10 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim cannot depend from any other multiple dependent claims.

See MPEP § 608.01(n).

Accordingly, the claims have not been further treated on the merits.

Restrictions

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 1-2, drawn to a composition for inhibiting mycotoxin contamination in cereals containing at least one or more compounds A selected from the group consisting of: ammonium salts of phosphorous acid or acid esters, primary or quaternary ammonium salts of phosphorous acid, etc and combinations thereof, wherein the compound A is an alkali metal salt or a polyvalent metal salt of phosphorous acid esters.

Art Unit: 1611

Group II, Claim(s) 1 and 3, drawn to a composition for inhibiting mycotoxin contamination in cereals containing at least one or more compounds A selected from the group consisting of: ammonium salts of phosphorous acid or acid esters, primary or quaternary ammonium salts of phosphorous acid, etc and combinations thereof, wherein the compound A is an aluminum salt of tris(ethylphosphonate).

Group III, Claim(s) 1 and 4, drawn to a composition for inhibiting mycotoxin contamination in cereals containing at least one or more compounds A selected from the group consisting of: ammonium salts of phosphorous acid or acid esters, primary or quaternary ammonium salts of phosphorous acid, etc and combinations thereof, wherein the compound A is potassium phosphate.

Group IV, Claim(s) 5-8, drawn to a composition for inhibiting mycotoxin contamination in cereals containing the compounds A according to any of claims 1-4 and at least one fungicidal active ingredient for agri-horticulture.

Group V, claim(s) 9, drawn to a method of inhibiting mycotoxin contamination in cereal comprising the step of providing an effective amount of a composition according to any one of claims 1 to 8 to the cereal.

The inventions listed as Groups I through V do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: the common technical feature in all groups is a composition containing alkali metal salts of phosphorous acid or alkali metal salts of phosphorous acid esters. These elements cannot be a special technical feature under PCT rule 13.2 because the elements are shown in the prior art. For example: Greiner et. al. (US 5,290,791) teach the use of

Art Unit: 1611

fosetyl aluminum (tris(ethylphosphonate aluminum) and the sodium, potassium or calcium salt of phosphorous acid as antifungicides (see bottom of column 5 and top of column 6).

Elections

First election for Groups I through V

This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows: compound A. Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election. Electing a compound that is not specifically disclosed as filed may be considered new matter.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

The following claim(s) are generic: 1-2 and 5-10.

The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: they are structurally different compounds, which depending on the substituents could belong to different classes and sub-classes and require different search queries. Greiner et. al. (US 5,290,791) describe the use of phosphorous acid or its alkali metal (sodium or potassium) for the treatment of mycotoxin (Fusarium) in cereals (see column 6, lines 1-2, and lines 44-54)

Second election for Group IV

This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows: fungicidal active ingredient listed in claims 7 and 8.

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election. Electing a compound that is not specifically disclosed as filed may be considered new matter.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims

are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

The following claim(s) are generic: 1-10.

The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: these are well known fungicides which have different structures and hence belong to different classes and subclasses.

Inventorship Notice

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Rejoinder Notice

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

Art Unit: 1611

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MARCOS SZNAIDMAN whose telephone number is (571)270-3498. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday 8 AM to 6 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sharmila G. Landau can be reached on 571 272-0614. The fax phone

Art Unit: 1611

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/MARCOS SZNAIDMAN/
Examiner, Art Unit 1611
September 9, 2008

/MP WOODWARD/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1615